



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

perusal of the book. On p. 167 reference is made to the probability that Rousseau owed his famous paradox to hints from Diderot. It is by no means certain that Rousseau did not get the notion from earlier English treatment of the problem of the effect of culture on society; to the present writer this seems likely. On p. 172, a reference might well have been inserted to the close of the preface to *Childe Harold*, where Byron directly compares his hero to Zeluco. On p. 174 it should have certainly been noted that one of *The Canterbury Tales* by the Lees is the source of Byron's *Werner*. On p. 175 it is said that Byron praised "the *Percy Anecdotes* and other things—either irresponsibly or impishly." Some readers will question the justice of the adverbs; let that pass. But for "*Percy*" surely "Spence's" should be read. The "certain Pickersgill" of p. 179 is of at least some shadowy interest as the author of *The Three Brothers*, the novel from which Byron derived the plot of *The Deformed Transformed*.

Scant justice is done to J. H. Shorthouse. It is true that he was *homo unius libri*, but to say that after *John Inglesant* he "never did anything else that was any good at all" (p. 292) is to ignore the merits of that delicately wrought allegory *The Countess Eve*. Nor are the claims of *Blanche*, *Lady Falaise* quite negligible.

It was wise to exclude the living from the scope of this history, yet we could wish that exception had been made in the case of the greatest of living novelists, whose work we must regretfully suppose all but finished, and whose masterpiece, *The Return of the Native*, is the best answer to Mr. Saintsbury's theory that bourgeois comedy is the typical novel-field. Mr. Hardy is, to be sure, mentioned, but it would have been well to give him space proportionate to that accorded to George Meredith.

But there is a defect in this book more serious than the various slight points on which I have commented. This is the absence of any philosophical point of view, any attempt to relate literature to life. It is a flaw that is characteristic of all Mr. Saintsbury's criticism.

With admirable taste and ability to "appreciate" good literature, exerting, moreover, considerable and certainly beneficial influence upon many readers, he fails to reach the heart of things. Looking upon literature as a thing apart, in an ivory-tower of aesthetic isolation, he makes little or no effort to reveal it as the reflection of the form and spirit of every age. Hence he never gains the philosophical grasp of the greatest critics, a grasp such as has in our own day been attained by Professor Courthope.

SAMUEL C. CHEW, JR.

The Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.

Uncle and Nephew in the Old French Chansons de Geste, by WILLIAM OLIVER FARNSWORTH. New York: Columbia University Press, 1913. ix + 267 pp.

In his dissertation, Mr. Farnsworth makes a careful classification of those instances of contact between uncle and nephew occurring in the *Chansons de Geste*. He shows that, often, the nephew was fostered and knighted by the uncle, accompanied him on warlike expeditions, lived in his *maison*, and was the recipient of numerous marks of his favor. The greatest solidarity existed between them. Advice and aid were frequently offered and received. Mutual vengeance was an obligation. Their love for one another was indicated by expressions of anxiety in times of danger, of grief in times of trouble; by their delight in one another's success, and by the endearing and complimentary forms of address mutually bestowed.

The author's choice of illustrative examples is good, his quotations, with few exceptions, are accurate, and he has succeeded admirably in showing the closeness of the bond existing between uncle and nephew. It may be questioned, however, whether this conclusion offers anything very new to the student of Old French, and whether the value of this portion of Mr. Farnsworth's dissertation does not con-

sist in its being merely a well-made catalog of common knowledge.

The author aims higher, however, than mere cataloging, and seeks to extend to the *Chansons de Geste* a theory recently posited¹ for the *Conte del Graal*. He believes that the relations between uncle and nephew in the *Chansons* are a survival of matriarchy, of that primitive state of society in which the offspring were the exclusive property of the mother and in which the mother's brother was the head of the family and the natural guardian of her sons. Mr. Farnsworth offers no direct evidence in support of his thesis. He admits that matriarchy as an institution had long since disappeared, but he believes that in the *Chansons* there are indications of a legendary, traditional, and sentimental survival—of which, albeit, the people of the times and the authors themselves were in complete ignorance. These indications consist chiefly in the intimate bonds uniting uncle and nephew, often closer than those between father and son, and in the computation that, as characters in the *Chansons*, there are more nephews than sons. It would seem, however, that there could be found for this intimacy an explanation more reasonable and more probable than matriarchy. It was the custom² in the Middle Ages for nobles to apprentice their sons to some powerful *seigneur*, who directed their education, granted them arms, and finally admitted them to full membership in the household or *maisniee*. The relations between *seigneur* and follower were of the closest, possessed of all those characteristics of mutual obligation and affection shown by Mr. Farnsworth to have existed between uncle and nephew. The *seigneur*, for the time being, was looked upon by the follower as his father, and held over him the authority usually possessed by the father. It was, furthermore, the custom for the members of a family to apprentice their sons to that relative who was most powerful. Hence, every great lord had

in his *maisniee* many young kinsmen who stood in a relation to him closer than that of an ordinary follower. His nephews were naturally, therefore, the chief personages of his *maisniee* and, in the *Chansons*, played a more important rôle than did his sons who were living in the household of some other noble. The intimacy of the relations between uncle and nephew might well be due, therefore, primarily to their being *seigneur* and follower and only incidentally to their being uncle and nephew. There seem no sufficient grounds for believing this intimacy an indication of the survival of matriarchy or possessed of any deeper significance than merely reflecting the cultural conditions of the times.

Mr. Farnsworth says that, in the *Chansons*, the father treats his son with severity, injustice, even hostility, while the uncle is friendly, kindly, and helpful. He sees in this different attitude a further evidence of matriarchy. This conclusion appears inexact. He cites a few examples in which fathers become angry with their sons; but, in every case, the son has done something to justify his parent's wrath. He cites, later, just as many examples in which uncles maltreat their nephews. He fails to take into consideration the large number of cases in the *Chansons*, illustrative of the usual rule, in which the father and son are united by the most friendly and loving of bonds.

A further evidence of matriarchy is seen in the fact that, at times, the nephew becomes the uncle's heir. But, as Mr. Farnsworth points out, the uncle in these cases has no living sons, and never dispossesses his son for his nephew. The author further supports his conclusions by showing that a man often traced his descent through his uncle instead of through his father; that, for example, Bertran is spoken of as the nephew of Count William of Orange and not as the son of Bernart de Breban. But, in these cases, the uncle is the central figure of the story, and what more natural than to express the minor characters in terms of the protagonist.

It is shown that *filz sa seror* frequently replaces *niés* as a designation for a sister's son. In every case, however, where *filz sa seror* is

¹ W. A. Nitze, *Modern Philology*, Vol. IX, January, 1912.

² See Flach, *Les Origines de l'Ancienne France*, Vol. II, pp. 455 ff. Also, Stowell, *Old-French Titles of Respect in Direct Address*, pp. 1-16.

used, *niés* would either not satisfy the rime or would not fill out the requisite number of syllables in the line. These reasons and the tendency of the Old-French writers towards paraphrase should cause hesitancy in laying much stress upon this point.

Mr. Farnsworth's strongest argument in support of his thesis seems to be that the majority of the nephews in the *Chansons* are sister's sons. It may, however, be noted in this connection, first, that the *Chansons* were usually written about a local personage whom it seemed desirable to connect with some national hero. This hero was a historic character about whose brothers, if any, more or less was apt to be known, so that it was more difficult to forge for the local personage a relationship with the brother of the hero than with his less prominent sister. In the second place, the *Roland*, as Mr. Farnsworth points out, strongly influenced the writers of the other *Chansons*, and Roland was Charlemagne's sister's son. Finally, many of the nephews in the *Chansons* were brother's sons, standing in a relation to their uncles equally close as that of the sister's son. Why should this be so if any vestige of matriarchy survived in the uncle-nephew relationship?

All the data advanced in support of the main thesis of the work thus seem open to a different interpretation, even though, taken together, they may have a certain cumulative value. In any event, we are indebted to the author for an excellent presentation of a most interesting subject.

WM. AVERILL STOWELL.

Amherst College.

The Literary Relations between La Fontaine and the "Astrée" of Honoré d'Urfé, by WALTER P. FISCHER. Philadelphia: Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, 1913. 8vo., x + 103 pp.

La thèse de M. Fischer est un travail consciencieux, et qui se lit avec agrément: l'exposition en est simple, claire, dégagée de lourdeurs

pédantesques. C'est une œuvre de début, et, si je n'en faisais point d'estime, je n'insisterais pas sur les réflexions qu'elle suggère et sur des critiques de détail. Assuré que M. F. peut fournir d'utiles contributions aux recherches d'histoire littéraire, je me permets de souligner quelques incertitudes de méthode et de composition auxquelles il serait aisé de porter remède.

Le plan adopté est le suivant: une brève introduction (p. 1-5) sur l'influence de l'*Astrée* au xvii^e siècle:—puis l'énumération de tous les passages où La Fontaine mentionne directement l'*Astrée*, et, sur chacun, un bref commentaire (p. 5-16); abordant ici l'opéra de La Fontaine, *Astrée* (1691), M. F., au cours d'une analyse détaillée (p. 16-33), en étudie les rapports avec le roman de d'Urfé; il introduit enfin une courte discussion d'une opinion de l'abbé d'Olivet à propos de l'influence de l'*Astrée* sur le sentiment de la nature dans La Fontaine (p. 33-37).—Dans la seconde partie du livre, M. F. étudie l'influence "diffuse" de l'*Astrée* dans les *Fables*, les *Contes* et les *Amours de Psyché et de Cupidon*.—Ce plan me paraît fort discutable, et cela pour deux raisons: 1) La distinction des passages où La Fontaine "cite" d'Urfé et de ceux où il s'en "inspire" est tout à fait artificielle et, d'ailleurs, pleine d'inconvénients: outre qu'elle oblige l'auteur à des redites, elle l'amène à donner place à l'opéra d'*Astrée* dans la première partie de son travail, l'isolant ainsi du reste de l'œuvre.—2) M. F. voulant arriver (p. 95) à une conclusion "chronologique" sur l'influence de l'*Astrée* (et cela est excellent)—, quelle étrange méthode d'étudier les œuvres de La Fontaine dans un ordre qui n'a rien à voir avec la chronologie, et de prendre tour à tour l'*Astrée* (1691), les *Fables* (depuis 1668), les *Contes* (1665-1676) pour finir par les *Amours de Psyché et de Cupidon* (1669)? En quoi cet ordre fantaisiste sert-il à la thèse qu'on veut établir?

Dans sa préface (p. vi), M. F. indique une sage précaution de méthode: "It has been difficult to draw a line between conscious borrowings and mere coincidences; . . . there is always the danger of ascribing to the influence of *one* work of the beginning of the century, what La Fontaine might have found